

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nsyolo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/550,644 | 04/14/2000 | David F. Sorrells | 1744.0010009 | 9317 | |
| Sterne Kessler | 7590 07/11/2008 Goldstein & Fox PLLC | EXAMINER | | | |
| Suite 600 1100 New York Avenue NW Washington, DC 20005-3934 | | | BHATTACHARYA, SAM | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| 0 | | | 2617 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application/Control Number: 09/550,644 Page 2

Art Unit: 2617

Response to Arguments

 Applicant's arguments filed 6/23/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments.

The RF circuit 115 and matched filter 130 in Wang simultaneously down-converts and performs a matched filtering/correlating operation. The RF circuit and matched filter can function as a single circuit entity to perform the two operations at the same time, given the broadest reasonable interpretation.

Examiner relies on Suzuki, not Wang, for a teaching of a matched filter operating on a carrier signal. The multiplier 55 and switch 66 in Suzuki perform down-converting and filtering, respectively, on a portion of an initially received carrier signal. Applicant's arguments do not address in detail any deficiencies in Suzuki with respect to this limitation.

The language of claim 2 does not state whether the step of convolving is part of downconverting or matched filter/correlating. The circular sliding integrator 150 in Wang is coupled to the RF circuit and matched filter. The output of the circular sliding integrator is based on one-half the number of time indices that the energy peak drifts during accumulation.

Accordingly, the circular sliding integrator convolves an approximate half cycle of a signal with a representation of itself, given the broadest interpretation of the these terms.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Ī | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|------------------|-----------------|--|
| | 09/550,644 | SORRELLS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Sam Bhattacharya | 2617 | |

| | Salli bilattacilarya | 2017 | |
|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | |
| X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | | FIRST REPLY WAS FI | ED WITHIN TWO |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ite extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp | lianas with 27 CER 41 27 must be | filed within two months | of the date of |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | appeal. Since |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | • | ` ' | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b | | | cause |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor | | ΓE below); | |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | | d | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or | ter form for appeal by materially rec | auding or simplifying ti | ie issues for |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | corresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | . , | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | • | _ |
| 7. If or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) for how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: | | l be entered and an ex | oplanation of |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but | hefore or on the date of filing a No | stice of Annual will not | he entered |
| because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se | al and/or appellant fail: ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | to provide a |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but see attached Response to Arguments. | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (| PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| 13. Other: | | | |
| | /Sam Bhattacharya/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617 | | |
| | | | |